DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 212 UD 029 275

AUTHOR Castaneda, Lillian Vega
TITLE Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations.
INSTITUTION Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Differences; Curriculum Development; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; English Instruction; Ethnic Groups; Holistic Approach; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Language Proficiency; Learning; Limited English Speaking; *Multicultural Education; Program Evaluation; Special Needs Students; Staff Development; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; California; Diversity (Student); *Language Minorities; Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

The Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center conducts Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations, a survey to identify programs that have successfully addressed the needs of ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse students. This report presents a cross-sites analysis of critical program elements at eight sites (six in California, one in Massachusetts, and one in Arizona) to demonstrate effective ways of helping students develop English proficiency, including instructional practices, curriculum development, and program implementation. The sites studied were chosen because their documentation and support data allowed analysis of critical elements. Across the sites, teachers shared a positive vision of children and believed that all children can learn. In the area of language acquisition, teachers emphasized natural language learning prior to form. A general theoretical orientation indicated that children learn best by doing, experiencing, and practicing. Across the sites, holistic rather than discrete skills instruction was practiced. An in-depth analysis of a staff development program at one of the sites is included as an example of the pedagogy, practices, and theories present across the sites. Contains 22 references. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358212

Southwest Regional Laboratory

4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720

(310) 598-7661

Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. L. Christensen
SW Regional Laboratory
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations

Lillian Vega Castaneda

The Southwest Regional Laboratory

November 1992

PURPOSE

The METRO Center's Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations is aimed at identifying programs that have successfully addressed the needs of ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse students. The two main objectives are to:

- identify instructional strategies required for culturally and linguistically diverse students to most effectively and efficiently (a) develop English language proficiency and (b) reach grade level in academic achievement in English; and
- identify programs and curricula recognized for their success in addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students along dimensions that support the instructional needs of ethnolinguistically diverse student populations.

The objectives of this report are to present a cross-site analyses of program critical elements that will address these research questions:

1. What instructional strategies, practices, programs, and curricula are required for culturally and linguistically diverse students to develop English language proficiency most effectively?
2. What key instructional strategies are necessary for culturally and linguistically diverse students (in multiple language settings) to reach grade level in academic achievement (content) in English?
3. What are the critical elements of practices, programs, and curricula common across the study sites, especially with respect to program efficiency and management?

This report is divided into five sections.

- The first section describes the research methods.
- The second describes emerging patterns and features across the eight sites.
- The third section includes preliminary analyses of the data within the context of the research questions.
- The fourth section includes in-depth analyses of a staff development program developed by one of the study sites. A description of the model, the implementation, and impact on classroom practice is provided. METRO staff believe this section of the report reflects many of the practices, pedagogy, instructional approaches and underlying theory present across the sites. Hence, we view this as a representative example of the critical features discussed in the body of the report.

METHODS

Sample Selection Process

In order to identify successful programs, METRO staff asked colleagues throughout the region to nominate sites believed to be exemplary in addressing the needs of language minority (LM), Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The nomination process began in June, 1991. Program success was based on evidence of at least two years sustained gains in student academic achievement in English language proficiency. Of the 42 sites nominated, 22 did not fit the objectives of the research project: Two sites were not included in the sample, because of their instructional emphasis, which did not deal specifically with instruction in multiple-language contexts.

Thus, a total of 20 nominated sites were contacted by METRO staff and asked to submit various types of program information for screening processes and for developing site descriptive protocols. In determining criteria for programs to be considered as promising, staff looked at similar research and validation efforts. Criteria were drawn from the California Department of Education's *Process for Recognizing Excellence in Bilingual Education: Exemplary Programs and Practices* and the SWRL based *Descriptive Study of the Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Programs (SAIP).*

Sites were asked to provide information regarding program features (e.g., a description of a particular program, curriculum or practice) and dimensions of school and district data related to size, geographic location, grades served, number of classes involved, languages spoken. Additional documentation surrounded school organization, instructional leadership, school climate, student characteristics and performance, instructional features and support components. Seventeen sites responded by providing the requested documentation. Site descriptive protocols (SDPs) were developed for these sites. Those not responding were been contacted by phone and encouraged to respond by contributing their respective district information.

Description of the Sample

General characteristics of the sample sites are:

- Locations: Six are in California (2 in San Diego County, 2 in Orange County, 1 in L.A. County, 1 in Ventura), one is in Massachusetts and one is in Arizona.

- School levels: Three are elementary, one is K-12, 3 are secondary and one is pre-school.

- Area designations: Of the eight, 4 are in urban settings, two are in a suburban "planned" community setting, one is in a suburban setting "unplanned" and one is in a rural/emerging suburban setting.

- Funding sources: Of the eight sites in the sample, three are partially supported by Title VII funds, two are supported by district moneys allocated toward restructuring, and one received state level staff development seed moneys. In addition, sites draw upon Chapter 1, School Improvement and state LEP funds.

The following sites were determined to have the most comprehensive documentation and support data. The various sites have some commonalties in theoretical orientation, delivery of instruction, and program design. Preliminary analysis show these patterns are consistent with the research-based framework to identify or develop successful approaches in multilingual settings (Castaneda, 1992) as well as findings from the recently completed *Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs* (SAIP Study), (Tikunoff et al, 1992).

- *Linda Vista Elementary School: A Comprehensive Program Model.* What started as a middle to working class Anglo community, then changed to a largely black working class community, is now a largely Southeast Asian neighborhood, with increasing numbers of Latino students. This program addresses the needs of all students, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, primary language or cultural background. A comprehensive program undertook restructuring of the kindergarten annex and elementary school. Staff, community members, students and site administrator work together to address the needs of a multilingual, multicultural student population. A variety of educational strands are offered, including mainstream English, bilingual (Vietnamese and Spanish), sheltered strand (broken down by level of language proficiency) and transitional program for LEP students entering an English only classroom. As well, this program provides continuous, formalized opportunities for integrating students through the use of school wide scheduling, sheltered content instruction, multi-graded, thematic/interdisciplinary instructional periods, teaming of teachers, instructional aides, and members of the community.

- *Central Elementary School: A School Restructuring Process For All Children.* This school is located in a largely working class community about 25 miles from the Mexican border. Experienced for years in integrating the children of immigrants, the district has been recognized nationally for its bilingual education programs and for the leadership it has provided. The school began a process of restructuring five years ago. Central began an intensive "internal" staff development program, to begin a process of shared management. Through this process, the school formulated a philosophy that under girds curriculum and instruction in which there is a shared belief that all children can learn and "show academic progress each year." The program is characterized by an adoption of an 11 month school year, an alternative reading program adoption, ungraded primary instruction, an entry level class for recent immigrants, integration of special education students, a second language program, primary language program and

literature based instruction. This is achieved through a variety of grouping and regrouping mechanisms for both staff and students.

- *Secondary Sheltered Content Instruction in the Irvine Unified School District.* The majority of LEP students in this school district come from upper to middle class Asian families. The sons and daughters of corporate executives (often on temporary assignment to the U.S. from countries like Korea and Taiwan to name a few), they come to the United States with the main interest of learning English and American culture. A few Latino LEP children are present in the district, as the district was once surrounded by burgeoning farmland, worked by Mexican migrant workers. Other students come from Europe and the Middle East. Middle school and high school students receive formal content area instruction in a sheltered English language development environment. Recent arrivals attend a magnet immersion program (maximum 1 year) prior to placement in a sheltered class.

- *The Sheltered English Approach: An Academic Excellence Program in the Glendale Unified School District.* This school district is located in a middle class community, with an increasing number of ethnolinguistic children and their families, moving in (e.g., Mexicans, Central Americans, Armenians, Vietnamese, Chinese and Koreans). This Academic Excellence project is designed to provide content area instruction for LEP students in Grades 4-6 who require both language and concept development support in social studies, science and health. LEP, non-English proficient (NEP) and fluent English proficient (FEP) students were grouped together in this multifunctional program which serves as an umbrella for participants in the transitional bilingual education program. In this sense, the program functions as a critical component of a comprehensive program addressing the needs of all students, offering strands in the "regular" (English only), bilingual (primary language literacy) and multiple language programs. Students who came from minority languages for whom instruction in their first language (L1) was not offered, received instruction in a multiple-language context. Students from the bilingual strand often entered the SAIP as a "transition" prior to entering into the mainstream instructional context.

- *Transitional Bilingual Education Program (TBE) and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Program for K-12 Students in the Methuen School Department.* Instruction in this New England school department is based on a vision that views empowerment of teachers and students through a student-centered atmosphere, where all are learners, significant to one another in the teaching-learning process. This program includes a total student enrollment of 5,300. Of this total, during the 1990-1991 school year, 347 students of limited English proficient fluency were serviced. The TBE program mainly addresses the primary and secondary language and literacy needs of Latino students, while the ESL program mainly addresses the other "low incidence" languages (e.g., Vietnamese, Korean, Gujaratian, Arabic and Turkish).

- *The Irvine School District Pre-School Program:* The primary goal of this project is to establish an early intervention program to prevent school failure. The major objective is to provide a "carefully designed early childhood learning environment in which children can be stimulated to achieve motor, sensorial, language, affective and intellectual development, literacy skills, acquire a second language and progress successfully in the elementary school years. The underlying theoretical framework recognizes the importance of early childhood education, with an approach which incorporates both Piagetian and Vygotskian. Motivational, affective and physical factors are considered as very important to the learning process. In this district-

wide program, children engage in ungraded instructional settings. The program offers three language strands: primary, sheltered and mainstream.

- *Nogales High School Comprehensive Secondary Bilingual Program:* The mission statement that guides this program states that "all students are capable of learning and can be successful." Further, there is a statement that says "teachers cause learning" and can be a "positive influence in the lives of students". The curriculum that drives instruction is designed to accommodate all students. In this school-wide program, teachers team in order to provide effective instruction to LM/LEP students. Further, students engage in laboratory instruction, (e.g., computer assisted instruction). Courses offered for the LEP student may be found across the various departments (e.g., typing, bilingual secretarial skills, ESL I, ESL II, ESL III, International Baccalaureate Spanish III and IV (advanced placement level), world history, American history, pre-algebra, algebra I and II, and biology). Two fully bilingual counselors are available in the counseling office to advise LM/LEP students. Staff at Nogales High are encouraged to receive an ESL or Bilingual endorsement in order to teach LEP classes. Teachers receive an addendum of $800 for a provisional endorsement and $2,000 for a full endorsement. Thirty-six out of 82 classroom teachers are bilingual, or ESL endorsed.

- *Peer Coaching, Sheltered Content, Cooperative Instruction and Mainstream Subject Matter Teachers: A Staff Development Model in Practice in the Oxnard High School District.* The staff development model is an integral component of the educational program designed to address the needs of linguistic minority students in a "borderline" rural/suburban high school district. The Oxnard Union High School District is located on the coastal plain of Ventura County, about 55 miles northwest of Los Angeles, California. The district has an enrollment of 11,500 students, with minorities comprising 67% of the population. Of this total, 3,112 are of limited English proficiency. A tradition of bilingual education for Spanish speaking students has extended to providing services once they "exit" primary language instructional settings, in the form of "comprehensible" or "sheltered" content area instruction.

Description of Data Source

Each site was asked to submit various type of data for the study, including school level plans, school/district/program objectives, goals, curriculum guides recommended instructional practices and approaches. Some of the sites submitted yearly evaluation reports (if the site is a recipient of either state and/or federal funds, e.g., Title VII). METRO staff contacted related project staff and obtained further information both through telephone conversations and face-to-face interviews.

Initial qualitative information for each site is presented in the form of a site descriptive protocol (SDP) These data are continuously updated as new information is obtained. Several of the sites have been visited, including, Linda Vista Elementary School, Irvine Unified, Oxnard High School District and Glendale Unified. In this case, data collection is mainly qualitative, relying on a mix of documented reports and participant observation. In one instance, classroom

lessons have been videotaped, transcribed and analyzed. From these data, METRO staff are currently developing cumulative case studies of each program and respective site/s. Each of these case studies is used as a way of describing the actual program (approaches, theoretical underpinnings, salient elements). Cases are "cumulative" in that they continue to be updated as staff gather new data (based on interviews, observations, reports) which are "re-worked" into the overall "pictorial framework" and add to the unfolding "story." METRO staff will continue to update these cases and add both macro and micro information as observations and data collection efforts continue.

EMERGING FEATURES

As in all qualitative research, on-going data collection and analysis drive the direction of the inquiry. In this sense, the data "speak" for themselves and guide the focus of the investigation. A current task of the research is to look at the data across sites, and begin to form patterns, themes and/or features and their categories. This leads to the development of propositions concerning the data. This type of approach encourages the systematic theoretical questioning of the data and the integration of theory as it emerges from the field (Strauss, 1987), thus directing the focus of the inquiry. The process prompts a more formal aspect of analysis. In this section, patterns, general categories and their respective "emergent" features are outlined.

Instruction

In the area of instruction, the following patterns have consistently surfaced, contributing to the formation of several emerging instructional features:

- bilingual, mainstream, and multiple-language contexts;
- magnet immersion for recent arrivals; entry level classes for recent arrivals on a short-term basis;
- content area instruction (social studies, health, science, math) through English language development;
- cooperative groupings (homogeneous and heterogeneous); whole class and small group;
- ongoing grouping and re-grouping of students, teachers, instructional aides, community volunteers, cross-age and peer tutors;
- teaming of teachers, instructional aides, parents, and community volunteers;

- computer assisted instruction;
- student engagement viewed as highly desirable and ongoing;
- ungraded instructional groups;
- literature-based, holistic instruction for both L1 and L2 acquisition;
- instruction planned according to student academic need as well as level of English language proficiency;
- use of student native language (varying degrees) to build comprehension, concept building;
- integrated, thematic instruction across the curricular areas;
- team teaching;
- use of students' primary language as integral across the sites, for instructional purposes, toward building literacy, comprehension and concepts;

In the category of instruction a variety of pedagogical approaches, underlying theory and methods are evidenced. Several features emerge as significant:

1. Instruction is designed to accommodate the academic, emotional, and social needs of all students.
2. Practice is well grounded in the literature related to literacy, first and second language acquisition, critical pedagogy, cooperative/interdependent task accomplishment, and bilingual pedagogy.
3. Instructional planning and delivery is context-specific. Teachers address instructional issues in a variety of situations, e.g., mainstream English, multiple-language and bilingual contexts, magnet immersion programs and entry level classes.
4. Teachers deliver instruction and use English language development techniques across the subject matter areas, e.g., history, geography, math, literature, science.
5. Teachers make use of their students L1 (primary language) as a means of increasing "access" to content knowledge, checking for understanding, comprehension, and concept attainment.
6. A variety of groupings are consistently utilized across the various classrooms, e.g., homogeneous, heterogeneous, ad-hoc, ungraded, by level of English language proficiency and academic need.

Curricula

In the area of curriculum, a variety of theoretical and practical approaches have emerged across the study sites. These include:

- literature based instruction;
- restructuring as a vehicle to implement an alternative reading program adoption;
- use of teacher developed English as a second language materials;
- curricula as a transitional program for second language learners (bilingual contexts);
- curricula as the main course of study (multiple-language settings);
- English language development and literacy acquisition through holistic, interdisciplinary curricula and whole language instruction;
- grade level, state adopted subject matter material presented in a sheltered context;
- curricula dependent on students' level of English language proficiency and availability of primary language teachers;

This category incorporates several critical features which include an emphasis on grade level, state adopted curricula (reflective of the various state frameworks) that promote holistic approaches to curriculum and instruction. Curricula takes a variety of student factors into account, including the level of English language proficiency and "grade appropriateness," and academic preparation. Curricula reflect integrated instructional approaches. These features emerge as significant:

1. Curricular approach is consistent with various state mandates and is grounded in research, e.g., literature based, integrated, thematic instruction.
2. Curricula reflect a holistic approach to teaching and learning. An emphasis on teaching concepts, meaning, and content (beginning with the "whole" {e.g., a story selection} and moving to the smaller "parts" in which various skills are embedded) emerges as a salient feature.
3. Student academic needs drive curricular selections. Curricula does not drive or direct student learning in a "top-down" model. Rather, student needs play a critical role in curricular selections and use.
4. Students' level of English language proficiency determines how curricula will be used, e.g., higher degree of teacher talk, modeling, use of realia (for pre-production {beginning English language learners} students) versus higher degrees of student talk in a context-reduced (limited to "no" use of visuals, gestures, prior information building) situation with full-production (apparently "fluent" in English) students.

5. Curricula are not selected or used as contrived, "recipe" or "canned" student learning aides--presumably, "programmed" for student success.

Program

At the programmatic level, the following patterns have emerged to lend to the formation of emergent features across the sites:

- restructuring (formal and informal);
- involvement of certificated, classified, and administrative staff, along with members of the school community in planning the instructional program;
- various instructional strands at the site level;
- integration of students/formal and informal (homogeneous/heterogeneous);
- school-wide scheduling;
- context-specific staff development;
- shared decision making;
- bilingual counselors;
- early childhood intervention;
- teacher planning time during the school day;

Program patterns reflect a variety of practices in the areas of staffing, planning, scheduling, school-wide policies, governance, and staff development. The following features are significant at the program level:

1. Restructuring has occurred (both formally and informally) as a way to redefine instructional practice, curricular thrust, and general organizational/management issues.
2. Restructuring (at the formal level) serves as a catalyst for change from an authoritarian organizational structure to a process of shared decision making and planning, between teaching staff, administration and community.
3. Schoolwide practices contribute to the orderly, day-to-day function of school, e.g., scheduling, use of various instructional strands, and teacher planning time during the regular school day.

4. All adults in the schools play an active and critical role in shaping the underlying philosophy and mission of the school, as well as curricular and instructional approaches.

School/Community

Several interesting patterns emerged with respect to the school and community settings, both separately and in relationship to each other. They include:

- restructuring as a vehicle toward shared decision-making and governance, that involves teachers, support staff, and parents;
- formation of job-alike groups, (including school and community individuals) grade levels, for communication, planning and articulation purposes;
- parenting classes;
- restructuring as an agent for curricular and instructional change;
- "implementation" of program by other (non-solicited) sites or use in both LM/LEP and mainstream contexts;
- collegial/peer interaction between adults in the setting;
- monetary incentive for ESL/Bilingual endorsement;

Interaction between the school and community settings appears to be a salient feature across the sites. Both "communities" engage with one another on a variety of levels. As well, the "school" communities (across sites) employ several key practices at their respective sites:

1. Parents are active members of the school community, as reflected in their contributions and membership on school-based committees, representation on school governance issues, and time volunteered in class.
2. Parents interact with each other, staff, and faculty, during formal governance meetings, parenting classes, and as classroom volunteers. Communication between home and school is on-going.
3. The school community encourages, plans for and implements opportunities for increased communication and articulation (in an ongoing manner) between teachers, administrators, support staff in the school.
4. The school community uses several "non-traditional" approaches toward accommodating the needs (stated in #3) of teachers, through the use of "release time" for planning both on a daily and/or weekly basis, within the regular school day.

5. Peer coaching (both formal and informal) is viewed as a preferred approach for reinforcing new methods and practices in class. This includes peer feedback, modeling and debriefing.

Undergirding Theory Surrounding School Climate and Instructional Approach

In the area of theoretical orientation, the following patterns surfaced from the data and form the base for the overall implementation of the programs:

- shared belief by all adults in the setting that all children can learn;
- focus on academic, emotional growth through social interaction;
- focus on language acquisition rather than language teaching;
- instructional emphasis aimed at building meaning (through assisting students with comprehensible input) and the function language, rather than the form of language;
- focus on holistic, integrated instruction rather than teaching isolated, discrete skills;
- incorporation of the natural language approach, principles of second language acquisition and the role of the primary language in second language teaching and content area instruction (in the second language);
- a collective understanding that students can assist one another in the teaching/learning process;
- incorporation of Piagetian and Vygotskian approaches;
- belief that teachers, instructional aides and other support staff can work cooperatively to most effectively address the needs of the student;
- emphasis on teaching literacy and academic content in a variety of contexts;
- an acceptance of teachers as reflective, critical, lifelong learners;

Current theory and empirical research drive the theoretical orientation of the various programs. The following features are salient across the sites:

1. Teachers, administration, and parents share a vision of children that is positive in perspective. They believe that all children can learn and are capable of successful academic performance. This is achieved the rough setting and maintaining high expectations of all students, and by creating learning communities.

2. In the area of language acquisition, teachers emphasize natural language learning, prior to form. Initial focus is placed on meaning and understanding (through comprehensible messages). Skills development follows as necessary, and this is in congruence with the continuum of natural language acquisition (Krashen, 1981; Cummins, 1981, 1989).

3. A general theoretical orientation states that children learn best by doing, experiencing, and practicing as reflected in teaching and learning theory.

4. Holistic vs. discrete skills instruction is practiced across the sites. This is reflected in both literacy and content based instruction.

Next, we turn to a discussion of the eight sites in the context of the research questions .

PRELIMINARY ANALYSES

What instructional strategies, practices, programs, and curricula are required for culturally and linguistically diverse students to develop English language proficiency most effectively?

What key instructional strategies are necessary for culturally and linguistically diverse students (in multiple language settings) to reach grade level in academic achievement (content) in English?

These related questions are addressed in this section. The first, speaks to the notion of English language development and the best conditions under which students will become proficient. This question deals with the issue of language acquisition, and, a focus on language. The second question addresses the notion of instructional practices and the use of English language development techniques in teaching grade appropriate subject matter information. Both questions are grounded in the literature surrounding first and second language acquisition, literacy, learning, and bilingual pedagogy.

The instructional strategies contributing to the success of teachers in multiple-language settings is consonant with the research on first and second language acquisition. One theory focuses on children's acquisition of a first language in a naturalistic setting beginning in the home, with parents, siblings, and others and later extending into the community and school setting. The theory holds that children are not explicitly taught the grammar of the language that they are acquiring. For example, a parent speaking with a toddler does not say, "Today we are going to discuss the present-progressive tense. Please take notes and repeat after me." Similarly, second language learners best acquire a new language under natural conditions, with an emphasis on meaning and function, rather than form (Krashen, 1981).

Preliminary analyses shows that teachers create opportunities for their students to use language in natural contexts. Language use (written or verbal) is not contrived or forced. Teachers use a variety of instructional aides to make concepts "clear" and comprehensible, building input, e.g., use of manipulatives, advanced organizers, key vocabulary, pictographs, extended wait time, cooperative group task completion, partner activities and peer review, to name a few. Some of the programs use a state approved ESL curricula that emphasizes levels of proficiency in English, and provide appropriate student activities. Whether or not teacher's use publisher or teacher-made curricula, instruction is not grammar based, characterized by the use of dialogues, sentence chains, cloze (fill in the blank) and verb conjugation activities, repetition, and the teaching of discrete skills. In this sense, teachers approach their craft from an additive perspective, rather than a deficit model (which assumes that students come to the learning situation as "remedial" learners). It should be noted that this finding is in congruence with earlier inquiries (Tikunoff et al, 1992; Garcia, 1991). In this case, teachers are firmly rooted in their understanding of language acquisition principles and appropriate instructional practices. Critical to this finding is the importance of strong on-going staff development programs that are offered across the sites.

Teachers also take into account the critical importance of the students' primary language in second language acquisition (Cummins, 1981). As reflected in data submitted by the eight sites, and through selected ongoing interviews, teachers understand this relationship and apply it in their daily instruction. For example, at several of the sites, some of the children receive literacy instruction (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in their primary language. Later, when they are at least at an intermediate level of English language proficiency, and when they can read fluently (and at grade level) in their primary language, they "add" English reading to their academic repertoire. In this instance, teachers rely on their students' current knowledge (surrounding literacy) and draw upon their primary language literacy as they introduce English language reading and writing processes.

When literacy instruction is not provided in the primary language, LM/LEP students receive instruction in English language development. In this case, teachers build their students understanding (both receptive and spoken) of the English language. They rely on using student's prior knowledge, use of visuals, student interests and cooperative tasks, as a mechanism to engage children in natural language use. As these LM/LEP students begin to use English, teachers will allow the use of the L1 in order to clarify, build comprehension and meaning. Preliminary analyses show that literacy instruction may be literature based, thematic, or interdisciplinary in approach. In some cases, literacy and language may be taught in the context of content, or though

student selected topics. Overall, as shown in documents submitted by the sites, and based on selected interviews and observations, teachers tend not to engage in criticism or overt error correction. Instead, students are allowed to self-correct.and teachers model appropriate language Further, teachers create learning environments that are student friendly, where, it's okay. to "make a mistake." Teachers across the eight sites create environments where children engage in a variety of tasks. This is accomplished in a variety of ways, e.g., individual, small group, partner pairs, etc.

Theory of language and literacy and implications for practice appear to be significant, re-occurring features across the selected sites. Teacher's understanding of the relationship between language and literacy are critical, in that, collectively, the perspectives embrace a notion of thinking that organizes instruction that is student centered, based on student needs. Altwerger and Flores (1989) view whole language as an "elimination of ability grouping and a democratization in regard to privilege, access, and personal power." This definition questions traditional basal instruction. Whole language instruction is student driven, in direct opposition to basal instruction which focuses on pre-determined skills development. Initial analyses shows a distinct trend in this direction, with regard to literacy instruction in both the L1 and L2.

In relation to content area instruction and academic achievement in English, teachers across the sites use a variety of instructional strategies that are reflective of those found by Tikunoff et al (1991). These approaches include a strong grounding (by the student) in English language use (intermediate fluency level), as well as ongoing opportunities for natural use of language.

A key preliminary finding that must be stressed, is the practice of teaching grade level subject matter content. Curricula are not watered down. Instead, teachers utilize a variety of effective instructional strategies, take into account issues of learning and first and second language acquisition, and cooperative grouping, and incorporate this into lessons. For a review of the types of strategies used, please refer to the fourth section of this report.

Finally, a significant feature that needs continued investigation involves the use of integrated, thematic instruction across the curricular areas for teaching content material to English language learners. This practice borrows heavily from practice in mainstream contexts and warrants continued inquiry and analyses regarding impact and effectiveness with LM/LEP students. As well, notions of literacy, language, and holistic instruction in English language development contexts is worthy of focused study.

What are the critical elements of practices, programs, and curricula common across the study sites, especially with respect to program efficiency and management?

Effective practice, strategies, and supporting theory, are impacted by teacher's opportunity to apply them in daily instruction. In other words, recommendations may be made regarding state-of-the-art pedagogy and curricula, but, teachers must be provided the correct "conditions" and context in which to apply these. This relates to issues of feasibility, appropriate use, and, implementation of the curricula, strategies, or program. In the case of the eight sites, several issues are significant. First, teachers are provided with a realistic context in which to practice their "craft." This has been accomplished by restructuring, both at the formal and informal levels. At the informal level, some teachers have banded together, formed teams, and/or grade level groups, in order to articulate, plan, team teach and peer coach. At a more formal level, several of the sites have undergone a process of restructuring, well into the fifth year (in two cases). Total staff buy-in and support for programs (multi-dimensional in nature) are the norm.

Formal restructuring has contributed to the formation of exemplary programs that are context-specific in design and delivery. In this case, several of the sites act as both mainstream, bilingual, and multiple-language, learning communities.

Restructuring has also provided ongoing opportunities for communication, articulation, and planning to occur between administration, parents, and community members. This is considered a critical aspect of the schools at an institutional level and warrants continued, focused analyses. It appears that, by restructuring, schools have effectively and efficiently pulled their resources in order to deliver quality instruction to all students. Further, it calls for parents, teachers, staff, and administration to negotiate and provide a vision and goals for the respective schools.

Another feature that adds greatly to program efficiency and management, is reflected mainly in the use of schoolwide practices, e.g., scheduling, teaming, instructional strands, and teacher planning, to name a few. Because these practices occur at a school-wide level, resources appear to be appropriately used, contributing to the orderly function of school.

Restructuring has raised interesting issues in the area of governance. This is an area that warrants continued, focused inquiry and analyses. It may be that the governance structure may impact (ultimately) at the instructional level.

In the area of curricula, in multiple-language contexts, costs are not necessarily a significant feature, in that, teachers mainly utilize state adopted curricula, and modify it to address the needs of their students. While schools may allocate funds to purchase ESL or primary language materials, most of the sites rely on teacher's talent and ability to use the appropriate content area text/program, adapting it to the needs of their students, in multiple-language contexts In several of the sites, teachers develop holistic lessons, based on student interests. Hence, in some cases, teachers opt not to use the recommended text.

REPRESENTATIVE SITE ANALYSES

In this section a secondary staff development program (developed by one of the sites) for mainstream social studies teachers is analyzed. An emerging feature across the sites, shows staff development as an integral program component. Staff development plays a critical role in shaping curriculum, instruction, and programmatic practices across the sites. This example illustrates (and provides concrete examples) the instructional, curricular, theoretical, and programmatic features discussed in the previous section.

"Mainstream" refers to subject matter, English-speaking teachers (who do not teach in either bilingual, sheltered, English as a second language {ESL} or English language development {ELD} contexts) who selected to participate in this training. The staff development program focuses on training in the use of cooperative grouping strategies and sheltered/ELD techniques. The model promotes ongoing interaction between trainers and trainees, through the use of non-evaluative peer coaching processes. Trainers also serve as peer coaches and models. Teachers engage in activities and behaviors that are advocated for use in the classroom. The goals of this section are to:

- review the nature of staff development in general and in bilingual contexts;
- describe the training processes;
- retrospectively describe the nature of the peer coaching and teaming processes;
- explore the implementation of the instructional strategies and theory (addressed in the training) during the academic year and
- explore the potential effectiveness of the training with regard to implementation.

Preliminary findings from an exploratory study of the training and implementation are presented. These research questions are examined:

1. To what extent did peer coaching assist in the implementation of the strategies and processes presented in the training?

2. How did the teaming (during the training phase) impact teachers' later implementation efforts? (What was the nature of peer teaming process?)

3. To what extent did the training change teachers' ways of organizing and delivering instruction/what was the impact on teachers' pedagogical perspective?

4. What has the training experience allowed teachers to do differently at the curricular and instructional levels?

5. In what way did the training impact on teachers' ways of communicating academic content to students?

6. What was the impact of the training during the academic year at the programmatic level?

SETTING

Research questions are investigated in the context of a staff development activity called the *1991 Social Science Summer Academy* and subsequent classroom practice and implementation efforts during the 1991-1992 academic year. Visits continue into the 1992-1993 school year. The study was conducted in the Oxnard Union High School District, which is located on the coastal plain of Ventura County, about 55 miles northwest of Los Angeles, California. The district has an enrollment of 11,500 students, with minorities comprising 67% of the population. A complete breakdown for both the district and the three high schools is provided in Table 1:

Table 1

	Filipino	Black	Latino	Caucasiasian	Other
District	4.98%	4.86%	50.89%	33.16%	6.11%
C.I.H.S.	13.67%	5.78%	58.57%	14.957.	7.03%
R.M.H.S.	. 1.35%	2.49%	56.73%	33.16%	4.67%
H.H.S.	3.19%	7.60%	64.34%	20.54%	2.14%

In addition to being a minority-majority district, approximately 50% of the students qualify for categorical programs, as depicted in Table 2:

Table II

Program	Total # of Students	Site #'s
Compensatory Education	5626	1391 (51%)
Limited English Proficient	3112	1233 (45%)
Migrant Education	1311	390 (14%)

The boundaries of the Oxnard Union High School District include three incorporated cities, a large area of unincorporated county, and numerous communities. The demographic character of this larger community is almost identical to that of the district student enrollment reflected above.

Though situated only an hour's drive from the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area, the terrain of this area may be characterized as rich farmland, with main crops including lemons, broccoli, avocados, strawberries, and lettuce to name a few. The area carries an air of a rural suburb. Many farm workers have settled in the area, initially coming to harvest crops. A large number of their children attend school in the sending elementary districts and the receiver secondary district. These students are primarily Spanish speaking; however, other minority languages are served by school districts in the area, including Vietnamese, Cantonese, Korean, Philippino/Tagalong, Portuguese, Mandarin, Japanese, and Lao.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In an effort to improve educational and academic achievement of high school age LEP students, and in light of a 200% increase in a Southern California high school district, from 991 identified Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (1988-89) to 3,098 (1990-91), mainstream (English only speaking) social science teachers were selected to participate in a summer training academy (1991). They were trained in language acquisition theory, English language development, sheltered instruction, social studies content, and cooperative grouping strategies. The district's selection of mainstream teachers is consistent with findings from the recently completed *Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs* (Tikunoff et al, 1992) which identified key instructional practices that English speaking (mainstream) teachers used while teaching English language learners from a variety of linguistic backgrounds in both designated (e.g., bilingual, sheltered, ESL/ELD) and mainstream social studies classes.

The Training Academy included both staff and instructional materials development. Major staff development goals of the Academy include:

- train teachers in the pedagogic strategies of cooperative learning and sheltered instruction;
- equip teachers with peer coaching skills;
- offer teachers thematic instruction in the content areas of history, writing techniques and prompts applicable to history; and
- create a heightened awareness of the non-Western influences in World History, as well as the subject matter links between U.S. History and World History, especially the historical development of democratic ideals.

Instructional materials developed include:

- concept-consistent lesson designs which incorporate sheltered learning and cooperative learning strategies;
- support materials and writing prompts based on textual materials to be used in process writing assignments;
- lessons and support materials which stress the common themes within each respective subject (World History and U.S. History) and the theme connections between these subjects in the area of democratic ideals and
- non-Western World History units.

The academy workshop was conducted for thirty-two hours, over a five day period. The initial training focused on teaching the participants to incorporate "framework friendly" strategies and techniques into their teaching repertoire. The California Social Studies Framework was used as a guide in the development of lessons, which teachers designed for use in the classroom setting, using the techniques covered in the training. Simulations, reader's theater, process writing and strategies for engaging all learning modalities were presented. Participants also engaged in content area enrichment, including thematic instruction, the history of the non-Western world, cooperative learning and sheltered instruction activities. Another aspect of the training included reading across the social studies curriculum, to assist participants in designing appropriate literacy related activities. These combined activities were interwoven through the use of modeling and participatory activities.

Peer coaching was an integral component of the formal training process. It called for the trainer to be invited into the classroom to observe in a focus area identified by the teacher. This involved a pre-conference, observation, and follow-up conversation regarding the lesson, between the trainer and teacher. A critical aspect of the peer coaching is that the follow-up conference was non-evaluative. As one coach put it, "we tell what we saw" and the "[the] teaching [observed] raised questions and then I went into the trainer mode" (Interview, May 29, 1992).

After completion of the training, teachers were teamed and assigned to a four week summer session class. Average class load per team was thirty students, with a ratio of 1 teacher to 15 students. The team instructed the same students for the entire four weeks. A two-hour peer coaching conference/curriculum development period was added to the teacher contract time for each afternoon of the four-week teaching session.

Trainers presented information by modeling specific strategies they wished the participants to acquire and use in their teaching. For example, Cummins' Four Quadrant Theory was presented through a cooperative learning activity. While the theory was presented, key cooperative learning components were built into the lesson, including positive interdependence, individual accountability, group processing, social skills training, and face-to-face interaction. Next, the lesson (that had been modeled) was analyzed for its cooperative components, and the lesson plan for that unit was shared. In this way, all theoretical frameworks were formed through participatory activities.

During the last three days of training, the participant teams were allowed to collaborate in creating plans for instruction that incorporated the strategies being modeled. Time was allocated during the afternoon of the last day for the teachers to meet as teams and plan the activities to be implemented. The next section discusses the theory that guided the training processes.

Theoretical Framework

Several theoretical orientations under girded the training in the areas of peer coaching, sheltered instruction and cooperative learning. First, peer coaching consisted of an informal, collegial, interaction between the participant and coach. Coaching was non-evaluative, voluntary, and held in confidence. (Showers and Joyce, 1980; 1982; 1983). Showers (1985) identifies three purposes of peer coaching. First, is to build "communities of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft." Second, coaching develops shared knowledge and understandings which are prerequisite for the "collegial" study of new knowledge. Third, peer coaching offers a

structure for the "follow up" or "application" of the training. This extension of the training experience is critical for linking the new teaching skills and strategies into practice.

The model for sheltered instruction relied on the notions of language learning in a natural context, levels of proficiency in language acquisition, the role of primary language literacy and second language learning, and the connection between conversational and academic English (Krashen, 1981; Terrell, 1981; Cummins, 1981; Asher, 1977; Thonis, 1981). A critical aspect of the training included the practical application of the theories presented. Sheltered English is defined as an English Language Development (ELD) approach commonly referred to as "sheltered English," "sheltered content," and "comprehensible content." All three have similar meaning and function: to provide LEP second language learners with academic content instruction through the use of specific ELD strategies that are integrated with content instruction. Instructional strategies used to accomplish this include cooperative grouping configurations; use of visuals, realia, manipulatives and artifacts; increased wait time after a question has been posed by the teacher; slower, more precise speech by the teacher (but not "robot" talk); provision for teaching pre-requisite skills through a combination of specially designed instructional materials; and native language support. (Castaneda, 1991).

The five elements of cooperative learning, i.e., face to face interaction, positive interdependence, social/collaborative skills, processing and individual accountability (Johnson, Johnson and Johnson,Holubug 1984) were presented. Several cooperative learning activities for classroom use were also included, e.g., numbered heads, inside-outside circle; think-pair-share, brainstorming, 3 step interview (Kagan, 1985 and Johnson, Johnson and Johnson, Holubug 1984).

A major assumption of this training is that LM/LEP students will have increased opportunities for communication and interaction (and increased "access to learning {content}) when cooperative learning and sheltered instruction are present. Regarding cooperative learning, the trainer stated, that it is a "support for minority kids" and gives them "a chance to practice in a very non-threatening way" (Interview, May 29, 1992). This observation is consistent with the notion of "lowering the affective filter" of the student for language learning (Krashen, 1981). Student collaboration in the accomplishment of a task, rather than competition, is the overall goal. Students are hetrogenerously mixed based on language proficiency in English. In all cases, Language Minority (LM)/LEP students (from a variety of proficiencies) are mixed with English Only (EO) and Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students. Both trainers agree that the combination of heterogeneity and the "pulling together of the language and academic stuff" is key. These

assumptions are consistent with other instructional and programmatic practices (Tikunoff et al, 1992). The following section describes the literature on recent bilingual staff development and/or training.

BILINGUAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT, TEACHER TRAINING MODELS, AND PROCESSES

The terms, "staff development," "professional development," and "in-service and assistance" may be used interchangeably (Fullan, 1990). These terms identify activities and processes intended to improve the teaching and instructional skills, and performance of teachers, administrators, and classified staff in providing effective instruction to LM/LEP students. They provide this definition:

- an enhancement function that improves the performance of individual teachers, school principals, and instructional aides in the settings in which they work.
- an establishing function that promotes organizational change through introduction of new programs, new technologies, and new procedures in schools and school districts;
- a maintenance function that changes practice to assure compliance with preferred administrative routines and to support organizationally preferred modes of practice;

The training model investigated fits in the first category, that is, as an "enhancement function" toward a goal of improving individual performance in instructional settings.

Research shows that the most common form of staff development tends to be short-term, with little impact on actual classroom practice. Joyce (1990) identified a variety of "staff development opportunities" that are provided at the "option of the individual," (e.g., teachers, administrators and/or instructional aides), or are offered as "entities" or "packages" to schools. In this sense, all "impacted" staff are "required" to engage in the activity. A major drawback of the approach is that staff are not included in the planning and "needs sensing" processes that should inform the activity. Indeed, as shown in the Tikunoff et al study (1991), school districts/programs engaged in delivering effective instruction to LM/LEP students in multiple language classrooms often plan staff development efforts that are contextualized to a given school/community site. This contextual staff development planning, along with giving teachers a "voice" and "say" in the process, is viewed as a major strength in the sites studied by Tikunoff et al (1991).

Thus, it is generally understood that staff development efforts must address issues both at the macro (district) and micro (classroom) context, over an extended period of time, with ongoing bridging activities. These activities should merge the objectives of the staff development activity into real classroom practice, and an overall objective toward increasing student academic success. According to the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, "The best way to ensure that the nation's language minority students are receiving top-quality instruction is to offer them top-quality teachers" (Winter 1987-1988, Number 4).

Another key feature of staff development efforts has to do with the school district's ability to support development and assistance through the entire process. According to Ward (1987), this extended support must be taken into account, if one considers the time it takes to accomplish a "change" in teachers', administrators', and "others" understanding of theory, instructional strategies, knowledge and performance of new pedagogical paradigms.

According to research (though greatly limited) in the area of teacher training, eight characteristics can be identified as critical in putting together teacher development plans. They include the governance structure of the program, needs assessment prior to program planning, analysis of local and other resources, determination of training objectives, attendance incentives for trainees, variety of training options, and follow-up training and evaluation of training program effectiveness (Arawak, 1986; Guerrero and Mirabito, 1981; Reisner, 1983; Alaniz, 1979; Cardenas, 1983; Dominguez, Turner and Jackson, 1980).

Tikunoff and Ward (1991; 1992) identify five new directions for staff development that are particularly significant. They include:

- Practitioner (e.g., teacher, administrator, instructional aide, parent) insights about what is and is not working well in a school or classroom are increasingly the core from which staff development and program improvement efforts build;
- Staff development is shifting from a corrective orientation to developmental growth orientation;
- The context in which the skills and knowledge acquired through staff development will be applied is receiving increased attention as staff development is extended to include application of what is learned and evaluation of what occurs as a result;
- The linkage between inquiry-based staff development and school-based reform or restructuring is gaining attention;

- Professional development of new teachers is gaining in importance and is thought to require special forms of support and assistance;

Several research studies in education programs for LM/LEP students inform current approaches in staff development and are discussed in the following section.

Ramirez et al (1992) conducted a longitudinal study of early and late exit "bilingual education" and English immersion programs in an effort to ascertain their effectiveness. Students made progress in English language development and English academics, in varying degrees, depending on the program model. Whether students were in early exit, late exit, or immersion programs, they improved their skills in mathematics, English language, and reading (equal to or greater than the general population). Interestingly, reclassifying Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to Fluent English Proficient (FEP) status did not occur more rapidly in immersion programs, than in early or late exit Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs. The study suggests that LEP students need extended time, beyond the arbitrary three years that most programs usually offer, to increase students' potential for success in an English only, mainstream academic instructional setting. By extension, mainstream teachers in English Only contexts are an obvious source -- for staff development aimed at increasing academic opportunities for students in diverse language settings.

In the Tikunoff et al (1991) study, nine sites believed to provide exemplary instruction in multiple-language settings were identified. All nine sites held several common underpinnings at the administrative, programmatic, and instructional levels. A critical finding of the study is that the nine sites responded to contextual circumstances, which resulted in the organization and implementation of an exemplary instructional program (e.g., when planning curriculum, instruction and program development, schools took local "needs" into consideration. They considered their specific staffing, resources, schedules, and student "needs" based on number of minority languages served, number of bilingual teachers available in the target languages, etc.). Staff development was a key contextual circumstance to which each of the sites responded.

While each of these studies recommends that special attention be spent in providing specialized programs of instruction, Ramirez et al (1991) suggest that primary language content instruction enhances student academic learning in English. A recently completed study of programs and services for LEP students in California examined well-implemented programs, including bilingual late exit, bilingual early exit, double immersion, sheltered English, and English as a Second Language (ESL) pull-out (Berman et al, 1992). The final fifteen schools selected

represented a variety of conditions under which programs were designed, including diversity of student population, composition of LEP students, transiency rates, multiple-language groups, locale and concentration of LEP's. A major finding is that schools adapt to local needs, reworking and reorganizing existing programs, to create instructional environments that respond to the increased diversity of the LEP student population. This finding (related to instructional programs based on local contexts) is congruent with the Tikunoff et al (1991) and Ramirez et al (1992) studies, and supports contextual staff development efforts. Berman et al (1992) further state that all teachers need to be trained in second language acquisition and cultural diversity. They recommend that the state integrate LEP issues across subject matter areas.

Information on staff development in general, and in multiple-language and bilingual contexts, along with the recent literature on various instructional program models offers a strong (and growing) base from which to discuss training in bilingual and multiple language instructional contexts.

Key issues surrounding staff development in diverse language contexts will be discussed, within the parameters of the study, in the recommendation and conclusion section of this report.

FINDINGS

To what extend did peer coaching assist or detract from the implementation of the strategies and processes presented in the training?

Gathering information on teacher perspectives on peer coaching and teaming relied on interviews conducted after the training academy. Through these interviews, teachers reflected on the process, which was not extended into the academic year. Several patterns on peer coaching emerged. First, teachers recommended that peer coaching be implemented during the academic year, and not be confined only to the summer training session. This recommendation is consistent with the literature that is critical of "one-shot" short term staff development, as it is believed to be ineffective, and does not promote long-term change. This recommendation supports institutionalization of such practices (Tikunoff et al, 1992; Berman et al, 1992).

Teachers held a second common perspective on peer coaching which focused on the conditions in which it occurred. They agreed that it (peer coaching) should be voluntary, never forced, non-evaluative, and that coaches be "invited" into the classroom. The chair of the social studies department at one of the high schools stressed that while peer coaching could be extended

into the academic year, it would need to function as a "voluntary" activity. A third common perspective held that the district and school administration must support the effort at the institutional level, e.g., payment for substitute teachers in order for teachers to pre and post conference or attend training.

Overall, the participants agreed that the peer coaching component was critical to the training process, in that, they had ongoing opportunities to "try out" theories and instructional strategies presented during the training. Thus, teachers had the opportunity to "practice" and "apply" the new concepts and techniques, and gain immediate feedback on their "performance" from an "unbiased" third party. It may be argued that the peer coaching piece allows teachers to "observe" and "get out of their role set for a moment" as they observe another's interaction and communication approach with the same group of students. It may be that the peer coaching component gives teachers a rare opportunity to reflect and analyze their own practice.

Although participants would like to see this extended into the academic year, special care must be taken in the ongoing implementation of such an effort. As one trainer stated, "It [peer coaching] must be tied into training -- it can't be isolated, because, if it is, it begins to look like evaluation." This notion is in congruence with Showers (1985) who also distinguishes between coaching and evaluation as it (evaluation) "implies judgment about the adequacy of the person, whereas coaching implies assistance in a learning process (p. 4)." However, an underlying shared perspective of the teachers is that the trainer/coach was a "peer." This perspective is discussed in the next section.

> *How did the teaming (during the training phase) impact teachers' later implementation efforts? (What was the nature of the peer teaming process?)*

On teaming, eight of the nine teachers interviewed indicated a willingness to engage in this activity, as a support and "bridge" to the training and implementation processes. Several themes under girded the teaming process. First, teachers reported being "cast" into one of two roles. One of the pair assumed a "lead" teacher position (e.g., modeling lessons for his/her partner, providing support and feedback, answering questions related to classroom content or organization, etc.). In turn, the partner assumed a role in which s/he acted as a mentee or assistance giver. In this role, the "support teacher" often looked to the lead partner for guidance as stated earlier. The following example illustrates this relationship.

> This team consists of a recent graduate from a major university in Los Angeles, who perceived herself (and this was corroborated by her partner) as "hyper" and a "planner." Her partner believed herself to be more of an "assistance giver" and this

was supported by her team partner. While this may have been the case (at the superficial level), the "hyper planner" admitted that she had learned a critical lesson from her partner, in that, she became "more compassionate" and increased her expectations of the students. This admission provides a sense of balance to this particular team, in that, although both teachers categorized themselves into role sets, the relationship was interdependent, where there was a definite give and take.

In this example, both teachers seemed to "buy into" the role sets in which they were cast. The next example provides a lead teacher/support/mentee relationship, in which there was not "two way buy-in."

As the lead teacher stated, "The teaming experience was not as valuable-- I felt like a master teacher. If they do it again (teaming) .need to be very careful of the matching assignment. It was however "good" in that I never "let down." And the teacher continues, "..but, I never relaxed with the kids [lack of bonding] -- possibly there was a certain degree of competition." On the other hand, her partner states, "...what was good for me in the training was being teamed with an experienced teacher" and it "gave me more verifications" about what I was doing.

In the final example, two teachers seemed to "buy in" and support one another in their roles.

The "teacher mentee" in this twosome states, "our personalities clicked." "I was more creative and he has more content." She continues, "We had a real advantage in teaming because each teacher had his/her strengths and could discuss and describe on what s/he feels comfortable with." She explains that the "key" to this team is that "our personalities jelled." The "lead" teacher also agreed that the teaming aspect "made all the difference". He goes on to explain that, although they had a standard class, "the kids picked up on the teachers bouncing ideas off of one another" and, this he believed, was good for instruction. He further states "there was no ego involvement -- so this worked." He points out that pairing teachers who are complementary is key. Of particular interest is his suggestion that it is not necessary to pair two teachers from the same subject matter.

An interesting result of the overall teaming activity is that, during the academic year, several teachers who had not previously teamed together, but were at the same high schools, made "verbal attempts" at trying to plan and work together, although this occurred only at an informal, if not superficial level.

This collective data poses an interesting proposition. While peer coaching was instituted during the training academy, with trainers serving as "coaches" (although Showers, 1985, recommends that peer coaching occur with "peers", e.g., fellow teachers) two interesting dynamics occurred. First, the trainer/coach role was possible because the "trainers" were also "colleagues" (i.e., taught alongside fellow teachers during the academic year), and therefore, were accepted and viewed as "peers" by the participants. It was stressed during the coaching session that the trainee was acting as a peer. Post-conference discussions dealt only with non-evaluative topics.

Secondly, this role set was extended into the teaming context -- that is, while "teams" assumed a role set of "lead teacher" and "mentee teacher or assistance giver", these individuals described situations that may have called for "peer coaching" interactions, at an informal (if not implicit) level. This was (in fact) observed by the trainer/coach during the summer session (Interview, May 29, 1992).

> *To what extent did the training change teachers' ways of organizing and delivering instruction/what was the impact on teachers' pedagogical perspective?*
>
> *What has the training experience allowed teachers to do differently at the curricular and instructional levels?*

In this section, the research questions related to teachers perspectives of their respective "pedagogical shifts" (change) and the organization and delivery of instruction are analyzed. First, a discussion on teacher perspectives on whether or not (and how) they "changed" in their organization and delivery of instruction is analyzed.

Several patterns emerged in the category of teachers' pedagogical perspectives, in the organization and delivery of instruction. They are as follows:

- Teachers feel that the training strategies, philosophy, and theory allowed them to raise their expectations of students, and to provide a more "student friendly environment" and increased "access" to subject matter content and opportunities to learn;
- Teachers believe that all children can learn, given the proper instructional environment; and believe that students feel an increased sense of success;
- Teachers believe that the training allows them to create (increased) positive environments for students;
- Teachers believe that these strategies are "good for all students;" and
- Teachers plan lessons and deliver content material that are designed to provide students with an increased opportunity to interact with one another, and interact with the content through small group processes, the use of realia, manipulatives, and advanced organizers;

Several underlying teacher perspectives deal with a sense of "raised student expectations" and a belief that "all students can learn" when positive learning environments are created. This shared perspective surfaced continuously, and is significant in that, teachers shifted their "belief systems" or "paradigms". Teachers stated that prior to the training, they had operated in a "top-down"

fashion, often didn't "really listen" to what kids had to say, and never made use of small/cooperative/collaborative group activities.

This perspective supports the proposition that:

- The training allowed teachers the opportunity to move away from (de-emphasize)"transmission" models of education (Giroux, 1988; Maldonado-Guzman, 1983) toward more participative and inclusive pedagogical approaches;

This proposition asserts that the collective training and implementation activities impacted teachers' in ways that assisted them in moving away from linear pedagogical approaches (e.g., teachers usually do most of the talking, students seldom engage, and instruction is viewed mainly as a mechanism for teachers to "impart" knowledge). Within this definition, knowledge is "imparted" in most linear instructional environments, with teachers lecturing and students completing assigned readings and related writing under teacher directive.

A related proposition acknowledges teachers' perspectives on students' attitudes toward class. Teachers shared a common belief that, given the type of instruction offered in class, the students had an increased sense of "self" and "ability to succeed" because teachers made the content more accessible.

Teachers conscientiously "applied" the instructional strategies and theory covered in the training over the academic year. Although they teach mainstream social studies courses, the teachers reported that they are consciously (and increasingly) more aware of their LM/LEP students than they were prior to the training. They feel that the training has allowed them to continue to provide "service" and "attention" to these students within the larger mainstream context.

In what way did the training impact on teachers' ways of communicating academic content to students?

The following patterns emerged in the category of academic content:

- Teachers teach social studies as a content area, and integrate (embed) writing process and English language development activities consistently as they utilize a variety of collaborative inquiry approaches;

- Teachers discuss both historical and contemporary topics that are grade appropriate (e.g., the Internment of the Japanese Americans, The Soviet Union Becomes Russia, Brat Attack -- Children of the Baby Boomers);

In the area of subject matter content, teachers implemented the instructional strategies, content and language acquisition theory into their classes during the academic year. It should be noted that, over the academic year (although the peer coaching and teaming aspects were not continued) the actual "content" covered in the training situation, continued to surface -- probably having a direct impact on how teachers organized and delivered instruction. This was consistently observed in the classes, as teachers instructed students in historical and contemporary topics, in ways that called for students to engage with one another in ongoing face-to-face interaction. Teachers paced instruction by using visuals, advanced organizers, and small group processes, while acting as "facilitators" of the group processes, in a sense, "monitoring" the students during periods of student to student engagement. The following example illustrates the above-mentioned instructional strategies and "facilitative" role of the teacher:

> (1:40) The overhead projector stood in the middle of the large room, with islands of student tables surrounding the perimeter. On the overhead was a word bank entitled "Russia Becomes the Soviet Union." Words like Czar Nicholas II, Rasputin, Social Democrats, Bolsheviks and Vladimir Ulyanov filled the "bank." The teacher began, "O.K., we're going to be jig sawing on these vocabulary words. He quickly began to direct the students to get into their cooperative groups; "O.K., the person with the next birthday are ones, the next are twos..."threes, and fours. "Next, he put all the ones together, and so on. The students moved their seats into cooperative formation, forming a total of seven islands all together. Next, the teacher divided up the vocabulary words amongst the groups. He continued, "Now we need to figure out roles. O.K., again, let's figure out people with the next birthday, the person on your left is number one {leader, evaluator}. Number two is the recorder. Next person is the checker. Next person is the praiser." After he finished explaining the assignment and making final role assignments, he stated "O.K., everyone got it --- from now you have fifteen minutes. O.K. let's go quickly."
>
> (1:50) As the students began to interact with one another, looking up the words in their books, talking with/assisting one another, the teacher began to monitor the seven groups, moving from one "island" to the next, providing clarification, answering questions. At 1:55 he stated, "Checkers, bring your papers to me. I'm not going to come to you." As he moved to another island, one of the students raised her hand and asked (1:57), "Mr. Lyon, is Lenin the same man as Vladimir?" Soon, "checkers" from the different groups began to take their papers to "show" the teacher. After checking several papers, by the overhead projector, "Bobby, you have to copy these down so you can take them back to your team." At 2:05 he looked up and stated, "O.K. everybody, go back to your teams and get this copied down so you can hand it in."

What was the impact of the training into the academic year, at the programmatic level?

Several patterns emerged in the area of implementation efforts at the programmatic level, in the areas of application, student placement, and teachers' role/responsibility in the education of English language learners. These patterns function mostly at an informal level . They are as follows:

- English language development techniques and cooperative grouping learned during the training have begun to "filter down" into other (other than social studies: for example, they are being implemented in a college prep English literature class) taught by one of the participant teachers, whether or not LM/LEP students are present in the class.

- Teachers use the strategies learned in the training, in their subject matter mainstream classes, as a way of providing continued "service" and "attention" to LM/LEP and FEP students, while also providing effective instruction for others in the classroom setting (e.g., use of increased face to face interaction, cooperative task accomplishment, use of visuals, realia etc.)

- During the academic year, in the classes observed, Language Minority/Limited English Proficient (LM/LEP) and Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students are placed in college prep, standard, and general, mainstream classes alongside English Only (EO) students. Placement in these classes does not mean that ESL/Bilingual classes are not offered at the respective schools.

- In some cases, LM/LEP students are consciously placed in college prep classes (and "out" of general courses) because teachers believe that, if challenged, students may succeed in this rigorous instructional environment.

- Potentially, through integration of the training into mainstream Social Studies classes, LM/LEP students engage with a heterogeneous mix of students and thus, their learning becomes the responsibility of mainstream teachers. Responsibility is shifted/shared, where it is not only the responsibility of the "bilingual or ESL department" to provide content area instruction.

Teachers agreed that the training had impacted their "ways of seeing" the LM/LEP students. This had an *informal impact* on the placement of several such students during the academic year. Because teachers believed that the training strategies, philosophy, and theory allowed them to create "student friendly environments," there was a concerted effort by seven (of the ten) teachers to "place" those students in college prep courses, for whom such a placement would not necessarily have been made. A conscious effort was made on part of the teachers, to put this type of student in classes where they believed the student could succeed (e.g., quiet Hispanic girls, a boy from Thailand, a couple of Hispanic kids from the low-track who took one of the teacher's classes and wanted to sign up for her classes during the regular academic year.) As the last teacher put it, "...they {the students'} had increased self-esteem during the summer class...and therefore, thought I {the teacher} would make the content accessible during the academic year" (Interview, May 29, 1992).

While some students are placed in college prep classes, at an informal level (e.g., counselors do not conscientiously make these placements) due to the concerted efforts of teachers, another type of placement occurs. In this case, LM/LEP and FEP students may be placed in either general or standard courses, where they are instructed alongside EO students. This occurs across the content areas, and is usually not a "conscientious" effort, on part of the counselors or teachers. It simply happens. In these classes (as in others across the country) LM/LEP students are placed in these classes and no special instruction is provided. Teachers reported that, because of the training, they felt an increased awareness and motivation to address these children, specifically.

Placement of LM/LEP students in mainstream content area classes potentially impacts programmatic practice. For example, it may be argued that, this type of training activity, (i.e., theory, instructional practices, peer coaching and teaming) engages mainstream teachers in experiences that provided optimum opportunities to apply strategies and theory on a daily basis -- especially in providing instruction to LM/LEP and FEP students. The consensus of the teachers is that the training allowed them to create "student friendly" environments for all (but especially LM/LEP students). Potentially, the placement of LM/LEP and FEP students within a heterogeneous mix of students in mainstream classes shifts the sole instructional responsibility from the bilingual/ESL teacher/department to the "regular" {mainstream} departments. This finding suggests a "shift" in the right direction -- one where all teachers assume responsibility for all students.

Data collection and analyses continue in this site. Updates will be given in future reports.

References

Alaniz, R. G. (1979). Effects of an inservice model construct on teacher competency achievement in a bilingual, bicultural field based setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas A and I University.

Arawrak Consulting Corporation. (1986). A study of alternative inservice staff development approaches for local education agencies serving minority language, limited English proficient students. Final synthesis report. NY: The Arawrak Consulting Corporation.

Berman, Chambers, J., Gandas, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., Olsen, L. and Parrish, T. (1992). Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English. BW Associates.

Cardenas, R. A. (1983). A discriptive study of the classroom instruction component of the ESEA Title VII Bilingual education program. Arlington , VA: Development Associates, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, CSULA.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento, CA: CABE.

Dominguez, D., Turner, W. E. , and Jackson, S. L. (1980). Measuring degree of implementation of Bilingual education programs: Implications for staff development and program evaluation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Anaheim, CA..

Fullan, J.G. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Garcia, E. (1991). The education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective instructional practices. Santa Cruz: CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals*. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Johnson D., Johnson T., and Johnson-Holubug, E. (1984). *Cooperation in the classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Joyce, B. (1990). Prologue. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. xv-xviii). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B., and Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 1980.

Kagan, S. (1985). *Cooperative learning: Resources for teachers*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for teachers.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, CSULA.

Ramirez, D. (1992). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategies, early exit and late exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority students. Aguirre International.

Terrill, T. D. (1981). The natural approach in bilingual education. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, CSULA.

Thonis, E. (1981). Reading instruction for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, CSULA.

Tikunoff, W.J., Ward, B.A., van Broekhuizen, L.D., Romero, M., Vega Castaneda, L., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1992, October). Final report: *A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs.* Los Alamitos, CA: South Regional Laboratory.

Tikunoff, W.J., & Ward, B.A. (1991, April). Competencies of teachers of ethnolinguistically diverse student groups. Paper presented in a symposium at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Vega Castaneda, L. (1991). Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations: A Review of the Literature. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Ward, B.A. (1987). Using a clinical approach to teacher development. In S.H. Fradd & W.J. Tikunoff (Eds.), *Bilingual education and bilingual special education* (pp. 265-286). Boston: College-Hill Publication, Little, Brown, & Co.